S. HRG. 99-795

STATE-SPONSORED TERRORISM

HEARING

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
UNITED STATES SENATE

NINETY-NINTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

JANUARY 28, 1986

Printed for the use of the Committee on Armed Services

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

63-089 O WASHINGTON : 1986

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office
U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402

S201-30

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

BARRY GOLDWATER, Arizona, *Chairman*

STROM THURMOND, South Carolina	SAM NUNN, Georgia
JOHN W. WARNER, Virginia	JOHN C. STENNIS, Mississippi
GORDON J. HUMPHREY, New Hampshire	GARY HART, Colorado
WILLIAM S. COHEN, Maine	J. JAMES EXON, Nebraska
DAN QUAYLE, Indiana	CARL LEVIN, Michigan
JOHN P. EAST, North Carolina	EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Massachusetts
PETE WILSON, California	JEFF BINGAMAN, New Mexico
JEREMIAH DENTON, Alabama	ALAN J. DIXON, Illinois
PHIL GRAMM, Texas	JOHN GLENN, Ohio

JAMES F. MCGOVERN, *Staff Director and Chief Counsel*
ARNOLD L. PUNARO, *Staff Director for the Minority*
PATRICK A. TUCKER, *General Counsel*
CHRISTINE C. DAUTH, *Chief Clerk*

CONTENTS

	Page
Hon. Jeane Kirkpatrick, former United Nations Ambassador	4

STATE-SPONSORED TERRORISM

TUESDAY, JANUARY 28, 1986

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC.

The committee met, pursuant to other business, at 9:35 a.m., in room SDG-50, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Senator Barry Goldwater (chairman) presiding.

Present: Senators Goldwater, Warner, Humphrey, East, Wilson, Nunn, Stennis, Exon, and Dixon.

Staff present: James F. McGovern, staff director and chief counsel; Patrick A. Tucker, general counsel; Jeffrey H. Smith, minority counsel; John J. Hamre, Drew A. Harker, Carl M. Smith, and Judith A. Freedman, professional staff members; Colleen M. Getz and Russell C. Miller, research assistants, and Kathleen L. McGuire, staff assistant.

Also present: Gerald J. Smith, assistant to Senator Goldwater; Romie I. Brownlee, assistant to Senator Warner; Henry D. Sokolski, assistant to Senator Quayle; John L. Roddy, assistant to Senator East; Mark J. Albrecht, assistant to Senator Wilson; Alan Ptak, assistant to Senator Gramm; Mary A. Shields, assistant to Senator Stennis; Jeffrey B. Subko, assistant to Senator Exon; John B. Keeley, assistant to Senator Levin; Charles C. Smith, assistant to Senator Dixon; and Milton D. Beach, assistant to Senator Glenn.

OPENING STATEMENT BY SENATOR BARRY GOLDWATER, CHAIRMAN

Chairman GOLDWATER. The committee will come to order.

This morning the committee meets to receive testimony from former U.S. Ambassador Jeane Kirkpatrick on state-sponsored terrorism and its impact on the United States' foreign policy.

Today's hearing marks the first full committee review of the issues of state-sponsored terrorism. Undoubtedly the United States' response to acts of terrorism and our ability to formulate a policy for response invites controversy. This is evident by the differing public announcement recently made by the Secretaries of Defense and State, and I might include the President also.

I would like to remind members that we have a busy schedule today. Following Ambassador Kirkpatrick's testimony, we will reconvene in room SH-219 for briefings by the CIA and Department of Defense on recent terrorism incidents.

In light of that fact, I encourage members to limit their questions to national and international policy.

Our witness today needs no introduction. After having served for more than 4 years in the Reagan Cabinet as Ambassador to the United Nations, Ambassador Kirkpatrick resumed her position as professor at Georgetown University and senior fellow at the American Enterprise Institute.

She has authored six books and numerous articles and monographs. In May 1985 President Reagan awarded her the Medal of Freedom and in 1984 she received the French Prize Polique for Political Courage.

Senator Nunn, do you have any opening remarks?

Senator NUNN. I join you, Mr. Chairman, in welcoming our distinguished guest this morning. She is uniquely qualified to talk about this important subject of terrorism.

Unfortunately terrorism seems to be on the upswing in the world. Ambassador Kirkpatrick has not only had diplomatic and foreign policy experience, she has written extensively on this subject.

We welcome her this morning. We know we will benefit from her views.

Chairman GOLDWATER. If there are no further statements, Madam Ambassador, it is a pleasure as always to have you here. You may proceed as you see fit.

I will ask unanimous consent that opening statements by Senator Thurmond, Senator Denton, and Senator Dixon appear in the record at this point.

[The statements of Senators Thurmond, Denton, and Dixon follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT BY SENATOR STROM THURMOND

Mr. Chairman, I would like to join you in welcoming our distinguished witness, Ambassador Kirkpatrick, for today's hearing. The subject of terrorism and our response is indeed controversial.

The American people are very tired of repeated incidents where U.S. citizens are singled out for execution, or are murdered at random by fanatics of whose cause they may have never heard.

I must admit, however, that it is very difficult to conceive of a policy that our Nation can apply in all circumstances of terrorist attack.

Terrorists often locate their training camps in close proximity to noncombatants knowing full well the reluctance that the United States has to risk the lives of innocent bystanders regardless of the fact that innocent bystanders are prime targets for the terrorists. This point was driven home all too clearly recently at the Rome and Vienna airports.

I hope that we can help form a consensus to take strong actions against terrorist attacks. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

PREPARED STATEMENT BY SENATOR JEREMIAH DENTON

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank you for the opportunity to address this committee on the very serious, widely debated, and timely topic of state sponsored terrorism. Senate hearings on terrorism during the last five years have brought out sufficient evidence to conclude that there is more to terrorism than just a series of unrelated violent events perpetrated by a number of unrelated groups.

There is a clear global pattern in Soviet supported and equipped insurgencies seeking to destablize, by revolution and terrorism, whole regions, such as Southern Africa; to politicize established religion, such as in Nicaragua and all affiliate or surrogate states; and to export violence against the democratic governments of neighboring states in order to divert attention from the insurgency itself, as Nicaragua has done in El Salvador and Costa Rica.

The pattern that emerges from studying the testimony obtained, in more than 60 hearings before the Judiciary Subcommittee on Security and Terrorism, which I chair, and only last May in joint hearings with the Judiciary and Foreign Relations Committee, is that terrorism is the most widely practiced form of modern warfare.

The twentieth century is likely to go down in history as unique in the extraordinary scale of psychological terror and physical violence employed by totalitarian dictatorships in pursuit of political purposes. Their goal has been to maintain total control of their own peoples and to expand this kind of control over other regions and people.

Violence and fear have always been commonplace as a result of man's inhumanity to man. Simple terrorism observed in every part of the world is most commonly and correctly described as the use of criminal violence or the threat to use it against persons or property with the intent to further a political or ideological objective. As long as human beings pursue different objectives and some of them are inclined to take violent steps to gain their goals, the phenomenon of terrorism will persist.

Exporting terrorist skills and weapons across national borders, however, adds an entirely different dimension. Moreover, if the political or ideological purpose is the strengthening of one state at the expense of another, transnational terrorism may have important strategic consequences.

The 1980s clearly mark a high point in a new age of terrorism much of which is aimed at weakening and destabilizing the more open, politically pluralist societies of the world.

The sponsorship of ideological, religious, and political violence by one sovereign state in the territory of another state, using methods short of overt warfare, is the main ingredient of today's systemic conflicts. It is a phenomenon that cries out for careful definition and analysis by officials responsible for the national security of the United States. The delivery truck driven by a suicide terrorist and clandestinely packed with high explosives may turn out to be the most destructive weapon of this era, not the SS-18 of the SS-20 ballistic missile.

The primary problem is to formulate a precise definition of terrorist activity by certain sovereign states that are acting in ways threatening to undermine the values and stability of the U.S. body politic and to jeopardize vital American security interests around the world.

The secondary problem, even more difficult, is to identify the kind of responses that the U.S. Government and military forces can legitimately take, both at home and abroad, in defense of the American socio-political system against this type of threat.

These problems are thoroughly addressed in a Judiciary Committee Print entitled, State Sponsored Terrorism, a report prepared for the Subcommittee on Security and Terrorism in June 1985 by Dr. Ray S. Cline and Dr. Yonah Alexander of the Center for Strategic and International Studies at Georgetown University. The authors have also recently published the book, "Terrorism: As State Sponsored Covert Warfare," which I believe will be a useful tool as we try to decide how we should respond against state-sponsored terrorism.

Whatever policy we do develop will necessarily involve putting in place a command and control system for an appropriate, timely response to terrorism—a system that does not now exist. We will need an intelligence network inputting into that system. Then we need units of appropriate training and conformation that can be called upon the make the desired response.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased that this Committee is looking at the serious problem of state sponsored terrorism, and I can assure you that my Judiciary Subcommittee will continue to investigate all aspects of terrorism, as it has done since 1981. I look forward to reviewing the testimony of our most distinguished witness.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Prepared Statement by Senator Alan J. Dixon

Mr. Chairman, I share the concern of this committee about state-sponsored terrorism. Recent years have witnessed a period of growth in terrorist incidents. Perpetrators are becoming bolder and their acts are growing more destructive and deadly.

I am pleased to have before us Ambassador Kirkpatrick as we try to develop a strategy for dealing with terrorism. We are fortunate to receive her testimony.

The lack of a coordinated, cooperative response on the part of the United States and many West European nations was evident throughout the debate following the bombings in Rome and Vienna. I believe it is imperative that some kind of joint strategy be developed, a strategy that puts into place a mutual defense against ter-

rorism. It is obvious that the U.S. cannot do it alone. Civilized nations opposing terrorism need to work together. Instead we merely react to terrorism, independently of one another, and on an incident-by-incident basis.

For these reasons, I have proposed that the Senate urge President Reagan to take immediate steps toward convening an international Congress on terrorism. Along these lines, I would like to ask Ambassador Kirkpatrick a few questions.

Chairman GOLDWATER. Madam Ambassador, please begin.

STATEMENT OF HON. JEANE KIRKPATRICK, FORMER UNITED NATIONS AMBASSADOR

Ambassador KIRKPATRICK. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Thank you for your kind words of welcome and thank you, Senator Nunn.

It is for me a pleasure and an honor to be here this morning to discuss this most vitally important and terribly difficult subject with the members of the committee charged to help the President formulate policy on this issue and to protect Americans from this new and deeply important scourge.

I would like to suggest this morning one conclusion from my reflection on this subject and reading and experience with it and with policies dealing with it inside the United Nations and my fundamental conclusion, gentlemen, is that terrorism clearly is a contemporary form of war.

While it has some characteristics in common with crime, because it is violent, its practitioners not only have political motives and ideas in their heads about political goals which they seek to accomplish, but almost all the time those practitioners of terrorism are organized and are interrelated with other organizations and, unfortunately, more often than not, enjoy relations with and support from states, that is from governments. Their acts are not unplanned.

They are, in fact, part of an ongoing war against the United States, against our civilization and against some of our friends, and especially against our institutions and our way of life.

Now, all members of this committee understand that because we are a free society we are open and we cherish our openness. We also like to travel. As curious and adventurous people, we are particularly vulnerable to terrorism and the terrorists have understood this.

I think that the case of Colonel Qadhafi, who has been most recently leering at us from our television screens, illustrates the point that terrorists today are at war with the United States and that we need to conceive and to understand this as a kind of war.

Mu'ammar Qadhafi did not begin threatening to do violence to Americans after these most recent attacks on the Rome and Vienna Airports in which five Americans were killed. Qadhafi has been threatening to do war against the United States for the last several years.

At the time of the withdrawal of the multinational forces of the United States, Britain, France and Italy from Lebanon, Qadhafi made an extraordinary speech in which he, among other things, demonstrated his similarity to a shark. He thought he smelled blood and like a shark excited by the smell of blood, he concluded

that the withdrawal of the multinational forces constituted an enormous defeat for the United States and for the West.

He announced at that time in a long-long speech to the Libyan people that this withdrawal should be taken as the beginning of a war against the United States which would be continued until we have been finally defeated.

I was struck when Qadhafi mounted his boat with his missiles to go out to confront the U.S. aircraft carriers, undertaking exercises in the Mediterranean.

I was struck by his comments at the time of the withdrawal from Lebanon when he taunted the President, the American people, the French and the West for what he called our defeat, our clear defeat. He made very clear that the U.S. Navy and all the power of the United States would not deter him, and that he would challenge the power of the U.S. Navy.

May I just read a paragraph from that speech of Qadhafi on the 2d of March, 1984. He said:

> Finally, Reagan lost his nerve and used the *New Jersey* which he had used until then to threaten the Lebanese. He believed [Reagan] that once the huge guns of the *New Jersey* were fired, the people would surrender. See for how many days he fired the *New Jersey*, but no one retreated, the earth did not disappear, it was not replaced with water. People did not flee to the mountains.
>
> The *New Jersey* fired on the mountain and the popular nationalist forces kept advancing toward the American forces. The *New Jersey* is firing and the American Forces came under siege. They were forced to withdraw with helicopters, sounding a resounded defeat despite America's use of all its weapons, barring nuclear bombs.
>
> Decisive defeat in the face of the armed popular mass, defeat of the American forces at the hands of the national Lebanese force, compensated us for many losses.

He goes on to say, "Who brought about this glorious victory?" He said:

> We were working for days and months and nights. We and the Syrians and Palestinians and the Lebanese patriots and the Iranians have been working for some months in order to achieve this victory. We forced Reagan to flee like a rat.

And he goes on to say:

> The morale of the popular places has been strengthened as a result of America's defeat in Lebanon. We have decided to adopt the popular war of liberation which does not fear the *New Jersey* nor the F-16s or the F-14s and we forced Ronald Reagan to concede defeat and flee like a rat.

He likes that image. He continues and I will end this quotation:

> We must launch a people's war of liberation in every place where there is fighting for the sake of freedom. Of course, with the proclamation of the people's authority in which the Libyan people pledge to defend freedom on earth, where it is necessary, against the American imperialists.
>
> We must force America to fight on one hundred fronts all over the earth. We must force it to fight in Lebanon, to fight in Chad, to fight in Sudan, to fight in El Salvador. Through the people's war of liberation, we can force America to fight on all fronts.
>
> We must escalate the people's war in Latin America and Central America. We must escalate the people's war of liberation in Africa alongside SWAPO. We must escalate the people's war of liberation wherever America finds herself.

He says in a subsequent speech that:

> Nicaragua is particularly important and that the Nicaraguans must stand especially with the Nicaraguan Government because the Nicaraguan Government is a challenge to America on the very doorstep of imperialism.

He says:

Every Libyan must take up guns, bombs, and with their guns and bombs they will teach a lesson to America. We will teach a lesson to America greater than the Vietnam lesson. We have fought alongside Nicaragua because they are fighting America. Nicaragua is fighting America near its borders.

The American people will be strangled. We are working to build a wide front of people who are against America, Iran revolutionaries, Afghanistan, Nicaragua, Cuba, Namibia, Palestine, South Africa, Northern Ireland, we will form a wide integrated front which encircles imperialism.

Imperialism means us, of course. That is the first formulation of the theory of capitalist encirclement that I have ever encountered. The fact is that Mu'ammar Qadhafi lays out in his speeches a plan which sounds like the fantasy of a wild man, but is not that plan being carried out and implemented in the world today?

We simply must understand that when Mu'ammar Qadhafi and his colleagues shout, as they so frequently do, "Death to America, Death to Israel, Death to Reagan," they mean it. Their hostility is total. Their demands are uncompromising. Their behavior is very, very brutal.

They make that clear in such episodes as the hijacking of TWA-847 and such acts as kidnapping and continued imprisonment of our fellow countrymen in Lebanon. They make that clear in support of the hijackers who singled out and murdered Leon Klinghoffer.

We need to be very clear that Americans are a very special target of this international campaign of terrorism, of which Mu'ammar Qadhafi is one, but certainly not the only principal practitioner. We must understand that he conceives himself and they conceive themselves as engaged in a war against us. They are not the only ones, of course.

Qadhafi gives us a list of those who are cooperating with him. That list which he gives us is confirmed by our own best intelligence and that of our allies, and by the research of the best scholars who work on this subject.

To take another example, both Libya and Syria have been deeply involved in attacks on Americans in the Middle East recently. Syria recruits, trains, equips and otherwise assists groups such as Abu Nidals', who we all know played a special role in the attack on the Rome and Vienna Airports. He arms, strengthens, equips, recruits, and provides assistance to Hezbollah and the Popular Front of the Libyan Liberation for Palestine, that is NFLP.

I came across this very week an interesting example of the links between governments and the official functions of some leading terrorists. I read in a Kuwaiti news report from Yemen, that in the effort to help mediate this terrible war that has been raging in South Yemen—in which thousands of people have been killed, and bodies left bloated in the Sun to be used as barricades—George Habash, the leader of the Palestinian Front for the Liberation of Palestine, was sent to serve as mediator.

That is a very interesting role, Habash as peacemaker. It is not one which would normally occur to us if we were thinking about international peacemaking and peacekeeping forces.

Syria, of course, provides a great deal of diplomatic support, refuge, and technical assistance. I am sure you gentlemen all know that intelligence, not only our own but others as well, indicates that the two trucks which were used to bomb American marines in

Beirut on a peacekeeping mission were rigged by Syrian professionals in the Bekaa Valley and driven along a route guarded by Syrian militia.

I am sure you know the hijacking of TWA-847 had very careful planning in which both Iran and Syria played a role. This was, of course, the occasion when young Bob Steithem was brutally stomped and murdered for the double crime of being an American and a serviceman.

What is my point?

My point is that we need to think of this as war because they think of it as war. They are at war against us. Whether one is at war with people does not necessarily depend on one's own decision. One may become the object of a war without intending it.

Now, what is war?

War I take to be the systematic use of violence to torture, kill, and maim, in this case for political goals, for the purpose of bending one's opponent to one's will. In this case the war is different than we are accustomed to. It is an unconventional war in which, although it is declared by governments because Qadhafi is head of a government and his colleagues are heads of governments, it is carried out only by irregular forces, and the battlefields are airports, supermarkets and delicatessens.

The targets are people who are unarmed and unprotected and unwary and who do not conceive themselves to be at war with anyone or the target of any attack. In this war the stakes are much higher than many people suggest to us.

Some people suggest that the cause of terrorism is the failure to resolve the problems of the West Bank; if only those problems were resolved, there would not be terrorism any more. But that, of course, is not so.

Some people suggest that if only the grievances of the IRA were resolved, then there would not be any terrorism.

Some people suggest if only there were independence for the Basque people, there would not be any terrorism.

Some people suggest if only the Italians gave up their government to the Red Brigade, there would not be any terrorism.

Some people suggest that if Germany dismantled its whole economic system, as demanded by the Bader-Meinhoff gang, or if perhaps overhauled its society, as demanded by Action Delete, there would not be any terrorism.

What that suggests is that if only we attempted to surrender, granting all the terrorist groups all their demands, there would not be any terrorism. Even that I fear, gentlemen, would not solve the problem of terrorism because terrorism continues.

The issue of terrorism is violence itself—supported and organized violence. I think they key words are organized and supported. They are enjoying official support, and they are at war.

It is important for us to bear these words in mind because if we do, then we will understand that our concepts of criminal law do not apply in the struggle against terrorism. Our concepts of war apply in the struggle against terrorism.

Believe me, I am not suggesting that the United States should declare war on anyone or that the United States should bomb anyone. I am suggesting that we Americans must understand that

there are well equipped, fully organized, coordinated, supported groups of people at war against us, and it is a collective effort.

Our problem is not with particular terrorists who bomb particular airports. Our problem is with the organization, the structure, the support structure, and it is to that problem that we need to address our responses.

Then and only then will we and other targets begin to protect ourselves against the scourge.

Finally, just one last point.

I think everyone here understands that terrorism today is a part of the arsenal with which those groups called national liberation fronts seek to disrupt society and topple governments and establish Marxist-Leninist governments.

Terrorism exists today in an organized state, in a process of escalating violence that leads from terrorism, and disruption, which is what a national liberation group attempts when it is weakest, to guerrilla war, to the prolonged conventional war and finally to triumph.

One can see, and Nicaragua is a good example of that process, the effort to bring to the same fruition violence in El Salvador and various other countries.

Thank you, gentlemen.

Chairman GOLDWATER. Thank you very much, Madam Ambassador.

Sam, do you have any questions?

Senator NUNN. No, I think the Ambassador makes a very powerful persuasive case.

I do have one question.

I agree with your analogies and I agree with your general feeling that groups are at war with us. I think terrorism has replaced conventional war in attempts to achieve local goals. I would agree with that.

I suppose what you are really saying is not so much what the solutions are, but the frame of mind that we must approach this with.

Is that correct?

Ambassador KIRKPATRICK. Senator Nunn, that is exactly what I am saying. I am saying that we must understand the nature of the problem as we try to map solutions.

I am specifically saying that this means that a good many of the concepts appropriate to thinking about criminal law in the United States are not appropriate in thinking about responses to terrorism, and that the questions of individual responsibility of individual terrorists are only marginally relevant to this problem because the problem is one of organized violence with organized support.

Senator NUNN. I know there are groups in different parts of the world that have different political goals and you enumerated those very well.

In the Middle East a large number of groups seem to me to be against any settlement or any solution including any peaceful solution on the West Bank.

Ambassador KIRKPATRICK. That is right.

Senator NUNN. It also seems that over the years that terrorism from their, in my view, very distorted perspective, but nevertheless their perspective, is indeed working.

Would you not agree that the moderate, if you were to call them that, forces in the Middle East who would like to pursue peace indeed would see the eventuality of recognition of Israel, that those people are being intimidated more and more by these terrorist forces?

Ambassador KIRKPATRICK. Absolutely, Senator Nunn.

In the same two speeches of Quadhafi from which I quoted, he makes very explicit his conviction that the biggest enemy of all, the number one enemy is what he called the Arab reactionaries. The Arab reactionaries are, of course, Egypt and Jordan and Lebanon. He considers the leaders of those nations traitors to the Arab cause.

The goal, he says, is a unified Arab nation that stretches from the Atlantic to the gulf. He states very clearly that the Camp David accords are the single greatest crime in modern history against the Arab nation, and that they and their authors will be wiped out, that they will fall.

He also makes very clear that their goal is the elimination of Israel from the face of the Earth. They are perfectly straightforward about the elimination of Israel as their operational goal. They predict it will happen within our lifetime.

They will oppose with all the instruments of violence at their disposal any effort at peaceful settlement. They have made, above all, Arabs and Palestinians who were ready to consider a peaceful settlement with Israel, the object of their undying hatred.

This, I believe, is what motivated the assassination of Anwar Sadat, the assassination of Bashir Gemayel, and the various mayors on the West Bank from time to time like Salwat who was shot dead in Portugal a few years ago.

Senator NUNN. Following your conclusions about certain groups having declared war on us, that many of these groups are supported by states, I agree with both of those, does it not follow logically that the states themselves have been indeed perpetrating acts of war on us and in effect in a de facto way have declared war on us?

Ambassador KIRKPATRICK. Yes, I think that follows. I think that we need to be clear that they have declared unconventional war on us.

Senator NUNN. Under your reading of international law, then, in effect we have had certain states, not limited to one, to have virtually declared war on us, though it be unconventional?

Ambassador KIRKPATRICK. That is my reading of international law.

I would also note, as George Kennan pointed out several decades ago, international law and especially international law as read by Americans, takes very little cognizance of a variety of unconventional relationships, including such matters as client states and support of non-state groups, and so forth.

We have, I think, large interstices in international law. Most of our international law today has conceptions of sovereignty, of war and peace which are appropriate to a 19th century category and World War I and II categories.

Senator NUNN. Do you have occasions to look at something less than a declaration of war in response to this?

Ambassador KIRKPATRICK. Senator Nunn, I believe that we need to respond.

First of all, we must protect ourselves and the way we protect ourselves against this kind of unconventional war is, above all, through intelligence and prevention. I believe there are steps we could take which go beyond those that we have taken.

I also believe we must have troops appropriate to protect us in this unconventional war and they will be unconventional forces by definition.

Senator NUNN. Thank you.

Chairman GOLDWATER. John.

Senator WARNER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Madam Ambassador——

Chairman GOLDWATER. We are going to limit the questioning to 5 minutes because of her time.

Senator WARNER. We are grateful for your coming this morning. I have followed with interest the articles recently published, authored by you, on this subject.

Might I ask unanimous consent that one or more of those articles appear in the record?

Chairman GOLDWATER. So ordered.

[The articles referred to follow:]

WE CAN DO SOMETHING ABOUT TERRORISM

(By Jeane J. Kirkpatrick)

It seemed last week that terrorism was proliferating as rapidly as AIDS and that, like the disease, it can affect anyone, though certain people, mainly traveling Americans, are an especially high-risk group. The hijacking of the Achille Lauro, the heartless murder of an elderly, crippled American, the threats, the terror—all recalled the ordeal of TWA Flight 847 and other terrorist attacks of recent years.

But, this time there was a difference. This time the U.S. government responded. The hijackers were intercepted. They are in jail. The Italians may not extradite, the hijackers may not even be punished. But at least this time the U.S. government made clear that it could not be counted on to remain passive when terrorists attacked Americans.

There were other differences as well. For the first time ever, the Soviet Union joined in a statement of the U.N. Security Council condemning terrorism. And Yasser Arafat himself solemnly assured American TV audiences that he deplored this sort of thing.

To be sure, the U.N. Security Council didn't condemn the attack on the Achille Lauro the way it condemned Israel's retaliation against the PLO headquarters in Tunis. That was a real condemnation—with a resolution (which has the force of law) proclaiming Israel to be guilty of aggression and in violation of the U.N. charter. The condemnation of the hijacking of the Achille Lauro was a less censorious "presidential statement." Still, the Soviets didn't block it as they have always blocked statements deploring terrorist attacks.

This doesn't mean that either the Soviets or the PLO has undergone a change of heart, but there has at least been a change in tactics. It also doesn't mean that the United Nations has become an effective instrument for fighting terrorism—a presidential statement is not binding. Moreover, U.N. corridors buzz with suggestions that, in intercepting the Egyptian plane, the United States may have violated international law. There is even less reason to believe that the PLO has forsworn terrorism. The Achille Lauro hijackers acted in the name of the Palestine Liberation Front, which is closely associated with the PLO. This is doubtless one reason that the hijackers spent time informing their American hostages, "Reagan no good, Arafat good." The Israeli government has stated officially that it possesses "abso-

lute, complete and irrefutable proof" that Arafat had advance knowledge that Palestine guerrillas would attack the Achille Lauro.

Meanwhile, Soviet and American hostages are still being held by rival Lebanese groups. But the seizure of Soviets in Beirut does not alter the fact that terrorism remains, above all, a Western problem. Few Western nations have escaped terrorist attacks on their citizens. And the problem has become progressively serious as terrorist groups understand just how difficult it is for modern Western nations to defend themselves against this type of violence.

Terrorism causes us problems because we are open societies, because we travel a lot and tend to trust each other. Terrorism defies our familiar categories of war and peace, friend and foe, civilian and combatant. It attacks unexpected people in unexpected places. It resembles war, but it is undeclared, and its targets are unsuspecting, unarmed and unprotected. It resembles crime, but unlike simple crime, it has political motives. It aims to affect the composition of governments and the policies of states. Sometimes it succeeds.

What can we in the Western democracies do to protect ourselves against bands of violent men who mock our restraint?

Well, we can try to be clear about the issue. The issue is not, as some commentators have suggested, whether there will be a Palestinian state in the Middle East. That was not the issue for the Khomenites who held our embassy and its employees hostage for so long. It was not the issue for the Hezbollah, who beat to death an American serviceman and terrorized the passengers of TWA 847, or the suicide bombers who drove their truck into the U.S. Marine barracks in Beirut, or those who hold American journalist and educators and officers in Beirut. It was not the issue for those who bombed the seaside resort that held the British cabinet. It is not the issue for those who shoot Spanish policemen in cold blood.

The issue is violence as a form of political action. The issue is whether ordinary people—all of us—are to be targets and victims in endless undeclared wars. What can we do?

We cannot simply declare war on terrorists because often we do not know who they are or where they are, and when we find them, they have hidden out among civilians. We cannot treat terrorists as they treat us, because we care more than they about human life and about law. Like our own forebears, and like modern Israelis, we can learn again to protect ourselves and each other—with sky marshals, tour marshals and cruise marshals "riding shotgun," with intensified inspections and insulated flight crews, with vigilance. We can refuse to travel in conveyances and to countries that do not take adequate precautions. And when we are serious, mobilized and determined enough our government will know it and the terrorists will know it.

Meanwhile, the capture of the Achille Lauro hijackers is a large step in the right direction.

A Week of Choices—and Surprises

(By Jeane J. Kirkpatrick)

Leon Klinghoffer's murder has been confirmed, the passengers of the Achille Lauro have gone home, but the political and diplomatic fallout continues. The hijacking confronted the governments of the United States, Egypt, Italy and Yugoslavia and urgent, unwelcome choices.

Governments hate stark, important choices made in full public view with no opportunity to equivocate or obfuscate. But in the fast-breaking case of the hijackers there was no place to hide. So, as in a real life game of truth-and-consequences, they made their choices—choices that set off a series of interesting international misunderstandings.

The government of Egypt chose to release the hijackers, thus offending the United States rather than the PLO. The United States chose to offend Egypt rather than permit the hijackers to escape. The government of Italy sought to slip through the horns of the unwelcome political dilemma: they would prosecute some of the accused, but release the PLO leader, Mohammad Abul Abbas, who planned the action. For the Yugoslavs it was apparently no contest. Faced with offending the PLO or the United States, a Yugoslav official commented, "We have good relations with the PLO, and we support the Palestinian cause. You can draw your own conclusions."

The consequences of the choices were about as expected. The government of Egypt was "offended" and wounded by the U.S. action and also by Italy's support of it. The United States was offended by Egypt's release of the hijackers and by Italy's and

Yugoslavia's release of PLO leader Abbas. Italy's government complained that the U.S. interceptor jets had violated the country's air space.

The Israelis were, of course, offended that the hijackers had set out to attack Israel. And it was reported that the British protested the Egyptian government's delay in permitting British crew members to leave the Achille Lauro.

However "inconvenient," the stark choices and decisions forced by the hijacking were revealing. They provide useful information about the priorities of the nations involved and point out how easily nations can fail to communicate with each other.

Both Egypt and Italy demonstrated gratifying concern for freeing the hostages from control of the hijackers. As long as that was the issue, the response of these governments was swift and unambiguous. A number of other governments, including Tunsia and Syria, also offered cooperation at this stage. Some were undoubtedly motivated as much by hostility toward PLO leader Yasser Arafat as by solidarity with the United States. But whatever the motive, their cooperation was welcome.

Once the problem had shifted from freeing the hostages to apprehending the hijackers, the priorities of our friends also shifted. When the issue was freeing the hostages, Egypt stood with the United States. When the issue was punishing hijackers, Egypt sided with PLO. The decisions of Egypt and Yugoslavia demonstrated how much importance both attach to their relations with the PLO. Forced to choose, both countries preferred to offend the United States rather than offend the PLO.

The Italians' case is different, since some hijackers were held for trial and the investigation of the affair is being energetically pursued. However, the Italian decision to release Abbas in the face of substantial evidence concerning his role in the hijacking showed that government shared a concern for good relations with the PLO.

That concern of Italian Prime Minister Bettino Craxi proved one strain too many for the country's fragile coalition government. Craxi, condemned by a major coalition partner for his actions in the Abbas affair, resigned with a blast at the United States.

Perhaps most significantly, the surprise with which the governments viewed each other's decisions reveal real misunderstandings of the involved nations' priorities.

The United States was shocked that Egypt released the hijackers. Egypt was shocked that the United States intercepted its plane. The United States was shocked that Italy refused to hold Abbas. And Craxi was shocked (and appalled) at the American reaction.

Clearly the U.S. government did not understand how much Egypt and Italy valued good relations with the PLO. Neither did the Egyptian and Italian governments understand just how strongly Americans feel about apprehending and punishing terrorists who attack their countrymen.

Presumably, ties between Egypt, Italy and the United States will prove strong enough and important enough to weather the unexpected strains. Meanwhile, the hijacking gave Egypt a chance to further reestablish its Arab identifications through solidarity with the PLO—even though this occurred at the same time that Syria and Jordan were distancing themselves from Yasser Arafat.

On balance, it was a good week for Ronald Reagan and a bad week for Arafat. The image of the new "moderate" PLO was shattered by the hijackers' clear links to Abbas and the PLO. The new "image" was further damaged when a PLO member of the joint Jordanian-PLO delegation in London flatly refused to affirm Israel's right to exist.

These developments probably have not harmed prospects for peace in the Middle East. But they have surely affected the identity of some of the participants in a new peace process.

A Loud Voice But No Stick

(By Jeane Kirkpatrick)

How to protect Americans from terrorists remains the topic of the day in and around Washington, and well it might. In that regard, last week was not a good one for the Reagan administration.

Allies not only refused to cooperate on sanctions, they continued to continue to talk about it and to demean U.S. policies. Qaddafi's pictures leered and taunted from the covers of news magazines and network news.

I do not understand why our government chose to treat the Rome and Vienna airport massacres as a Libyan attack on Americans. So far as we know, the attackers did not specifically target Americans or American property. They did not

demand passports and single our Americans, like the hijackers on TWA 847 who stomped and murdered Robert Stethem because he was an American serviceman, or the hijackers on the Achille Lauro who first identified Americans, then shot Leon Klinghoffer and dumped him into the sea. The Americans slaughtered in the Rome and Vienna airports were innocent victims of a brutal crime, but they were not killed because they were Americans.

I also do not understand why spokesmen for the U.S. government chose this occasion to emphasize Libya's role and responsibility for Palestinian and Middle Eastern terrorism. Maybe there are good reasons. Certainly it does no justice to Qaddafi's Libya, which we know to be deeply implicated in much of the political violence in northern Africa and the Middle East. But then so is Syria, which permitted violent Lebanese, Iranians and Palestinians operating from the Bekaa Valley to bomb our embassy, murder American Marines and kidnap our fellow citizens.

Both Syria and Libya are deeply involved in terrorism in the region and with anti-Arafat Palestinians, including Abu Nidal. So, why speak out now?

I do not desire by my question to cast doubt on the legitimacy of blaming Qaddafi, who is clearly guilty of training, encouraging, harboring and assisting the practitioners of violent politics. I do desire to suggest that the administration was not *required* to respond to the airport massacres as though they were an assault by Qaddafi on the United States.

It is, however, extremely puzzling why the administration focused responsibility on Libya if it did not intend to take action against that country. Why create the impression of confrontation only to limp away?

The only effect of administration strategy was to strengthen the growing impression among many that Ronald Reagan resembles Jimmy Carter more than anyone conceived possible.

As Joshua Muravchik argued, once the president decided to make do with small symbolic gestures, it was necessary for him to make the case that no alternatives existed. But, of course, alternatives exist.

As in previous attacks, we know who is responsible and we know where they are. It is not information we lack. It is apparently will—the will to use force against those who use force against unarmed, unprotected American travelers.

It is not the first time that Americans have been attacked from bases in northern Africa nor the first time we have had trouble responding. Two centuries ago, Barbary pirates operating from Tripoli, Tunis and Algiers pillaged trading ships, enslaved captives and collected large sums of protection money from European nations which then as now regarded paying blackmail as the least troublesome way of handling pirates.

At that time the new American nation was both poor and weak, and our merchant ships were set upon with special violence until, to end this humilitation, President Thomas Jefferson sent warships into Mediterranean waters and extracted a favorable treaty from Tripoli. In the words of historian Thomas A. Bailey, Jefferson's vigorous action aroused patriotic fervor at home and awakened a new respect among foreigners for the United States. The man of peace, by facing up to harsh realities, thus reaped a rich harvest with the sword.

Today neither Ronald Reagan nor the American people seek a rich harvest from Tripoli, and no one desires to use force. Moreover, I do not believe the United States can by itself end terrorism. I do not believe we should try.

But those are not the questions. Americans have become a special target of violent men, and once that becomes clear, it also becomes intolerable.

All governments have an obligation to protect their citizens from violent attack. This is done through laws, courts, police, prisons. There are, however, no such international law enforcement institutions to protect travelers from terrorists. So governments, and specifically our government, must.

We do not need to go the source. We do not even need to go to Quaddafi. We do not need our allies' consent. Nor should we permit American media to decide when and where we should respond.

But terrorists who attack Americans must be informed, at a time and place of our government's choosing, that we and our countrymen are not feasible targets.

Senator WARNER. I agree entirely with your basic philosophy and, using the current Libyan problem as an example, that this administration, in your judgment, had overly reacted to that situation and as a result, had brought greater attention to Mr. Qadhafi and indeed that attention complicates the problem.

Ambassador KIRKPATRICK. I did not put it quite that way, Senator Warner.

What I suggested was that I had not, being no longer a member of the administration and being unaware of all of the intelligence available on those events, personally understood why we had interpreted the attacks on the Rome and Vienna Airports as attacks on the United States by Libya.

Now, I also said in the same article, however, two other things.

One, I assumed that if we were going to interpret them as attacks by Libya on the United States, then it was because we intended to take some action. Otherwise, I could not make sense of it in the context in which we did not have to do it.

Second, I made it very clear in the article that I do not regard it as an injustice to Mu'ammar Qadhafi for the United States to have identified him fully and clearly in this instance as a principal perpetrator and sponsor of terrorism against Americans and others in the world today.

Senator WARNER. I happen to be of the opinion that if we are to utilize the military force, and indeed you stated just how we should have trained troops, which implies on certain occasions we should utilize the military, that that utilization should come as a direct identification of a causal link in the perpetration of terrorism, whether they be individuals or state-sponsored terrorism.

In other words, it has to be a clear causal link between the act of the state or the group before we utilize military force.

Ambassador KIRKPATRICK. Senator Warner, what I believe and tried to say in my testimony is that the individuals responsible for terrorism today are not acting as individuals. They are part of organized groups and their action should be seen as the action of the group.

Therefore, I do not believe it is necessary to know which particular member of the Hezbollah or the Abu Nidal group perpetrated which particular act of bombing against which particular airport in order to justify an attack of an appropriate sort against the Hezbollah or the Abu Nidal group.

Senator WARNER. What would be your advice to the President as to the conditions under which we should utilize our military force in reprisal for a terrorist attack?

Ambassador KIRKPATRICK. First of all, I believe that there are additional measures that are important for us to take in the realm of prevention. I believe we should take those. We already made great progress in beefing up our intelligence and, obviously, we should continue to do that to the maximum extent so that we have advanced warning of such groups. We have made a lot of progress on that.

I believe there are preventative measures we can take in the range of greater protection for planes and ships, for example, and I think there are official and unofficial acts that can be taken to enhance protection of Americans in foreign countries.

Finally, our use of military forces—not armies and navies, but unconventional forces—I believe that when we know with reasonable certainty which group has attacked Americans, and we know who they are and we usually do, and we know where they are and

we usually do, then I believe that we should find a way in fact to attack that group.

Senator WARNER. With military force?

Ambassador KIRKPATRICK. I believe we should find a way to attack that group. I said at the Pentagon last weekend—in a conference on low-intensity warfare—that it seemed to me fundamentally unimportant whether the forces we use to fight this unconventional challenge were organized under the military or organized under the CIA or organized under some new department, I do not care. Those, in my view, are bureaucratic details.

That amused my audience, by the way.

Senator WARNER. I have one other question before my time expires.

The Deputy Under Secretary, Mr. Whitehead, just returned and indicated that the allies were not supportive.

Do you have a rationale as to why they have not come forth with the same vigor and intensity as our distinguished President?

Ambassador KIRKPATRICK. Senator Warner, I think I understand a bit better. At least I was less surprised than most of my colleagues since I had the experience frequently in the United Nations of finding it impossible to secure a cooperative allied response to various kinds of problems that seemed clearly to be problems. I reflected long on it.

I believe there is basically a tradition, which is understood among our European allies, of dealing with problems of this order individually. Getting together with them as we tend to do when we have a problem, they try to deal as English or French or as Dutch, they often try to deal under the table with what we would call protection money.

They work on a private deal. That is their preferred habitual way of coping with such problems.

By the way, they do not ask our consent for the decisions they make about how to cope with their own safety. They do not coordinate with us and I think we should be realistic about this. We should understand that when Americans are being singled out as targets, which they have been in a number of these attacks, then it is the responsibility of the American Government to make certain that Americans are not attractive targets.

That responsibility cannot be discharged by or devolved on our allies, nor excused because our allies are not willing in fact to take common action.

Senator WARNER. Do you feel the United Nations has a role in this problem and is capable of fulfilling the role?

Ambassador KIRKPATRICK. Senator Warner, in an ideal world, and an ideal United Nations, that would be the ideal instrument to deal with the problem. We know none of those things is true.

In fact, the terrorists are housed in the United Nations. Their sponsors even enjoy a veto. It is absolutely, utterly unrealistic to expect that there will be effective action against terrorism deriving from the United Nations.

Senator WARNER. Thank you.

Chairman GOLDWATER. Senator Stennis.

Senator STENNIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield my time back to the Chair. I am very much interested in the testimony.

Chairman GOLDWATER. Senator East.

Senator EAST. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Ambassador Kirkpatrick, we welcome you and appreciate your coming and your sharing your knowledge with us.

On this matter of dealing with terrorists, reading here from an article of yours in the Los Angeles Times Syndicate, you say:

> I believe the President was right to impose a total embargo on U.S. economic relations with Libya and right to insist that Americans working in Libya come home. He was right to emphasize the character of the airport attacks and to inform the American people of the existence of irrefutable evidence of Libyan involvement in the attacks. He was right to call on our allies for common action to isolate Libya. These are appropriate steps in dealing with this regime. Sooner or later, however, it will be necessary to take on the terrorists themselves.

By "take on," I assume he means some form of armed combat. The essence of my question is that, it seems that we can all agree Qadhafi is not a good fellow. We can agree this is a war against us. We can agree that they take on the characteristics of a war of liberation in a slightly different form, but when we come down to the very hard pragmatic question of actually taking on the terrorists themselves, we come up without an answer, do we not.

In the Vienna and Rome attacks it is unclear whom we attack. What I am putting to you, I guess, is the ultimate and most difficult question.

How do we take on the terrorists in the sense not only of prevention, but I assume in the sense you mean of actually destroying their capability to inflict harm upon the defenseless and the innocent?

Ambassador KIRKPATRICK. I am not certain that we can, Senator East, destroy their capability to inflict harm. I have said in a third article I do not believe that we can eliminate the scourge of terrorism from the contemporary world because it is global and it is very complex. I do not even think we should try too hard.

I think our role should be a much more limited one and it should be in the first instance to alter the current situation in which Americans as Americans are singled out as targets for terrorists.

We all know when airlines are hijacked, they take out passports and single out the Americans. When cruise ships are hijacted, they single out the American passports. In Beirut they single out Americans and British and occasionally the French.

I believe that taking them on does not necessarily mean violent attacks. In my view, taking them on means the maximum possible preventive effort for one thing. Then it may mean kidnapping as we did in the first instance, with the hijackers on TWA-847.

It may mean wiping out a base. But it means action directly against the terrorists. I am certain that everyone here is familiar with antiterrorist actions that have been undertaken from time to time by the Israelis. Everyone is familiar with the antiterrorist actions presumably undertaken by the Soviets.

At least the stories are widely circulated about how the Soviets got back their hostages in Lebanon. I am not an expert in unconventional war, but I believe that we must have capacities in this field and from time to time bring them to bear if our efforts at prevention fail and these people continue to attack Americans, which I believe they will.

Senator EAST. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I know you are anxious to move on. I will forbear any more questions.

[The Los Angeles Times news article is as follows:]

NO EXCUSE FOR TERRORISTS

(By Jeane Kirkpatrick)

Attack by murderous attack, terrorists are teaching us about the world: about the vulnerability of open societies to assault, about the complexity and violence of Middle Eastern politics, about the difficulties of protecting ourselves, about the limits of our alliances and the reluctances of our allies, about the limits of law in international relations and about the limits of civilization as well.

"Of course," one thought before the attacks in Rome and Vienna, "the threat at airports begins after you check in." Not so. Travelers at airline counters are essentially unprotected. So are travelers at train stations. shoppers in department stores, pedestrians at red lights, students in classrooms and churchgoers.

Most people are vulnerable most of the time to attack by violent men, especially those ready to die to accomplish their bloody missions. In civilized society there is a rarely articulated understanding—reinforced by law—that we will not kill each other as we go about our daily lives.

Terrorism shocks us because it is organized and because it is political. And in our political tradition and political culture politics is not a violent activity.

"Oh, senora, be careful," a Central American housekeeper said to me a decade ago as I left for a local political meeting, "politics are so dangerous."

"Not our politics," I explained to her. We are a democracy.

Violence is, of course, the very antithesis of government by consent. But terrorists are not interested in the requirements of democracy. Some commentators tell us that Abu Nidal's group is not interested in politics at all. For them, it is said, violence is the end as well as the means, the goal as well as the method, a good in itself. "To kill Israelis" was goal enough for the men who murdered travelers in Rome and Vienna, or so a surviving attacker told his interrogators.

Now some commentators are contrasting the nihilism of Abu Nidal's group with the "diplomatic" goals of Yasser Arafat and his followers.

The distinction is not relevant. Remember the Achille Lauro "mistake"? They told us later they never meant to hijack that ship. The plan called for landing at a crowded Israeli port, opening fire and shooting until the attackers themselves had been killed—killing as many Israelis as possible in the process.

The man who planned that operation was an Arafat lieutenant who was released by Egypt, Italy and Yugoslvia, and is presumably today enjoying freedom in Iraq.

Arafat has denounced the Rome and Vienna attacks and accused Libya and Syria of sponsoring them to embarrass him and request a negotiated settlement with Israel. Libya, meanwhile, has taken to denying any responsibility for the attack. "Libya had nothing to do with it," said Qaddafi's foreign minister, who joined Arafat in deploring the attacks.

We know, of course, that Syria and Libya have tried to destroy Arafat's forces and that they support Arafat's rivals in a bitter struggle for power in the Palestinian movement. We know, too, that this struggle for power overlaps, but does not coincide precisely with the division between moderate and radical Arab states.

But so far, the differences among Palestinian factions have little practical significance for peace, democracy or Western interests in the Middle East. All these PLO factions deny Israel's right to exist, all utilize violence, all are closely tied to the Soviet Union and all actively support Soviet policies in Afghanistan, Angola, Nicaragua and around the world.

The issue that should concern us is not whether in their heart of hearts, gunmen seek goals beyond the violence they perpetrate. The issue that should concern us is the violence itself. Terrorist acts are the issue, not the motives or sincerity of those who commit them.

Some people and some governments excuse terrorists because they think terrorists are "sincere." Others excuse Palestinian terrorism because they approve the goal of a Palestinian state or because they lack sympathy for Israel or because they want to do business with the terrorists' sponsoring countries.

Most of our allies do not so much excuse terrorism as they try to deal with it privately under the table. The tradition of sauve qui peut (each man for himself) is more powerful among nations than the tradition of collective response. Most of our allies see their alliance with us as strictly limited to mutual defense against military attack, where we Americans see it as providing for mutual defense against all manners of ills.

Our allies declined to join in sanctions against Poland's repression of Solidarity. They declined to boycott the Beirut airport and declined to hold the murderer of Leon Klinghoffer for trial. Now they decline to join in sanctions against Libya.

The British foreign office has already reiterated that it finds sanctions ineffective (except, presumably, when taken at Britain's behest—as in the Falklands war), the Germans have recommended caution, the French have alluded vaguely to other unnamed remedies available under international law.

It is one more lesson in reality.

I believe the president was right to impose a total embargo on U.S. economic relations with Libya and right to insist the Americans working in Libya come home. He was right to emphasize the barbaric character of the airport attacks and to inform the American people of the existence of "irrefutable evidence" of Libya's involvement in the Dec. 27 attack. He was right to call on our allies for common action to isolate Libya. It all clarifies the situation.

These are the appropriate steps in dealing with an outlaw regime. Sooner or later, however, it will be necessary to take on the terrorists themselves.

Chairman. GOLDWATER. Thank you.

Jim.

Senator EXON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Ambassador Kirkpatrick, we are delighted that you are here.

In your view, how much credence is there to the theory that, right or wrong, our current muscle flexing in the Mediterranean is a likely prelude or an excuse for a military strike by United States forces against Libya or its forces?

Ambassador KIRKPATRICK. That has not really occurred to me, which is a way of saying that it does not strike me as very likely, if that is the case.

I believe that what we are doing in the Mediterranean today is asserting our right to be present in those international waters. Qadhafi continually dares the United States. He lays out a whole series of dares.

Senator EXON. I agree with that. I think that is well known and established.

What do you think we should do about it?

Ambassador KIRKAPTRICK. Senator Exon, I think every one of these situations has to be answered in a very concrete way. My own inclination is to believe, on the basis of what I know about the last attacks, if we have adequate evidence of Libya's direct involvement in those attacks, as we do in some previous ones—I know we know where Abu Nidal's camps are, and I know we know what Abu Nidal has done and will do to us—I think we should take out some of those camps.

I am not certain how because I am not an expert in these matters. I believe we should have the capacity to do so. I believe that if we do not, we had better develop it, we had better divert some funds from something else and develop some counteraction.

Senator EXON. Madam Ambassador, I think that is pretty well established that we do have the capacity. Some of it is not for public information, but we know that we have capacity. I keep asking why we do not use it. I agree with you completely that if we know where these terrorists are located, and if we can tie them reasonably, semi-directly, to some of these terrorist actions, then I do not know why we do not strike. It seems to me that we had better do something.

My last question is, from your excellent service to the United States in various capacities, the last of which was before the

United Nations, and citing the fact that you say this is a contemporary war, and I agree that it is, is the United Nations and the World Court so filled with pacifists or something worse that they cannot do anything about it?

And what, in your view, is the United Nations doing about this threat today, if anything?

Ambassador KIRKPATRICK. Senator Exon, they are not doing anything and they cannot do anything.

Senator EXON. If I had more time, I would ask why, but my time is up.

Thank you.

Chairman GOLDWATER. Senator Wilson.

Senator WILSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Madam Ambassador, I think you have put the case with even more stunning and compelling clarity today than you did in the op-ed piece I recently read in which you said, and I think this is a fair paraphrase of your conclusion, at a time and place of our choosing the terrorists and their sponsors must learn that Americans are not feasible targets.

I agree entirely with your point about maximizing prevention. Americans are not accustomed to living like Israelis. I think we will have to learn to live that way and perhaps more rapidly than might otherwise be the case because, even though we cannot destroy others capability to terrorize, I think we have failed to exact the cost for the exercise of terrorism.

I could not agree more emphatically with your point about trying to apply the niceties of our criminal law to a situation that simply does not permit that. The first duty of a democracy is to protect its citizens anywhere in the world.

That being the case, I have heard a number of people state, which seems to me not really analyzing the problem properly, that what good is it for us to undertake retaliation because we are dealing with kamikazes. That strikes me as a superficial analysis because however sponsors may employ kamikazes, it is in fact a very irrational, cold-blooded state-sponsored attack to attain political ends that we must be concerned about and they, I think, can be impressed if the cost to them is simply not worth it.

So, I quite agree with your point. While it may have exacted a laugh from your audience last week at the seminar on low-intensity war, the bureaucratic details are far less important than the development in this civilized democracy of the political capacity to engage in this new kind of unconventional warfare.

It is, I think, through your articulation that we may finally develop that kind of thing. I think more and more people are feeling the frustration that Senator Exon has expressed which I must tell you I share.

I have to assume that it is because of the responsibility to safeguard American citizens that we have been asked for forbearance as we have in the current instance where we do know the details.

I agree with you, I do not think we should be defining, certainly not openly what our response will be, but there should be an absolute certainty on the part of the state sponsors that they are going to suffer a cost and a high cost, one that will make it not worthwhile for them to continue.

That is, I think, the real point because to the extent that kamikazes are not organized and do not enjoy state sponsorship, they can be dealt with in a far more effective means.

Finally, I think that when we consider the network that you have so clearly drawn this morning for which the evidence exists, that we are compelled inevitably to see that the Soviet Union has been the supplier of the kind of sophisticated arms and kind of sophisticated terrorist techniques that will allow this network to function as effectively as it has.

It seems to me inevitably there must be a linkage. We must remember that the same people with whom we are sitting down and negotiating arms control in Geneva, is as a government, the same government that is sponsoring state terrorism by a number of surrogate states.

That, obviously, is something that has to be dealt with in a very special way. I think it has to be dealt with and I can only assume and hope that it is.

I have no questions, Mr. Chairman. I simply find myself in emphatic agreement with the views expressed by Ambassador Kirkpatrick. I think the Nation is greatly in her debt.

Ambassador KIRKPATRICK. Thank you.

Chairman GOLDWATER. Thank you very much.

Senator Dixon.

Senator DIXON. I want to share the expressions of support for the distinguished Ambassador's testimony that have been indicated by prior Senators and to express to her my personal high regard for her and the stand that she has taken here, a stand that I share.

I wonder, Ambassador, whether it would not be in the interest of our country, in addition to what you have suggested we ought to do ourselves, to talk to all other civilized nations, the United Kingdom, the French, Germans, Soviets, Italians, Chinese, everybody, to see whether we could have discussions that could bring about some kind of response on how we might extradite, how we might bring to trial and how we might surgically retaliate.

Frankly, case law in the United States shows that courts will bring to trial people that are secreted out of countries that will not honor extradition treaties, once they are in the United States. Those considerations ought to take place.

The offering of rewards by all the nations jointly, rather than just ourselves, and a variety of other sensible responses to get tough on an international basis.

Is that not worthwhile doing?

Ambassador KIRKPATRICK. Senator Dixon, first of all, thank you for your kind words. I wholly agree and I think we should do all of which we can. I applauded that in the article, for example, that Senator Wilson just read.

I think we should continue to do that, in our bilateral relations, in multilateral forums, wherever we are. We should generally work to that end, but we should not expect that it will solve our problem and especially, Senator Dixon, in the United Nations where I have had a lot of personal experience in trying to get simple statements of regret, in opposition to killing diplomats.

You would think if there was one subject in the world on which diplomats could agree, it would be that diplomats should not be

targets of terrorist action. Even that we could not get agreement on.

Senator DIXON. I would certainly share your concerns, there. The United Nations is great for talking and not much else, if you will forgive the attitude of this Senator about that, but I think a good many nations might be inclined.

I take notice of how the Soviets have responded, it is a little brutal, of course, but I imagine the message was received quite clearly. It seems to me that some genuine efforts could be made along those lines by the civilized nations.

We had a terrific conference at Bretton Woods one time about currency problems. It seems to me that problems of international terrorism are overwhelmingly more important than that. Quite frankly, may I say that when I return home now, I am surprised to find that the Israeli situation is one of the big issues back home. When you have a townhall meeting, they talk about budget deficits, but many people want to talk about terrorism.

I happen to be the owner of a travel bureau with my brother in Melville in southern Illinois. There actually is a notable decrease in the number of international travelers—you mentioned earlier how we are great tourists—as a consequence of this fear.

Ambassador KIRKPATRICK. Senator Dixon, I am not surprised by that. I have the same experience when I travel around the country and speak to audiences, too.

There is deep, very pervasive concern, anger and deep worry about it. I believe the Americans are right and this is good common sense in fact to feel this way. I think it is good common sense for Americans to refuse to fly on carriers that do not have adequate security and to countries that do not have adequate security.

I personally would like very much to see the Congress take some action that mandates sky marshals on international carriers, for example, the American carriers and certain other kinds of additional screening of baggage. It is routinely done by El Al and they do not have those problems.

Senator DIXON. We did act in the Senate on that last year, as I am sure the Ambassador is aware. At least Senator Denton offered the amendment. I, myself, had considerable legislation which was incorporated in the omnibus bill that was passed.

I express to you my personal admiration for you and the views you have expressed here and the fact you have brought to the attention of the American public through these kinds of activities the serious nature of the problem. I applaud you for that.

Ambassador KIRKPATRICK. Thank you, Senator.

Senator Humphrey.

Senator HUMPHREY. Madam Ambassador, in responding to Senator Wilson you started to say something about changing the situation in which Americans are singled out as Americans and it seems to me you went off on another track.

Can you expand on that thought? What can we possibly do to change that situation?

Ambassador KIRKPATRICK. I believe that we have been identified as people for whom there is no price for victimizing. I think there are some very fundamental facts of bully psychology that operate here. As long as there is a sense that Americans can be attacked

without any price being paid, then we are more likely to be attacked than people whom it is well known there will be a price for attacking.

Senator HUMPHREY. You are suggesting that Americans are singled out not only because our country is a leader among the Western nations, but rather because there is no penalty for attacking Americans, Americans are safe targets?

Ambassador KIRKPATRICK. Senator Humphrey, I believe that we are singled out because we are a leader. We are considered by the terrorists—Qadhafi might put it at some length—as the leader of the imperialists. That is surely one reason that we are singled out.

I think there is another reason that we are singled out and that is because we have been more careless about our security and taken fewer preventative measures and are less quick to exact the price for an attack.

Senator HUMPHREY. Do you think that there ought to be active covert measures to thwart terrorist attacks and to what length should we go in those measures if you think they are indicated?

Ambassador KIRKPATRICK. Certainly I think there should be active covert measures, I think there should be active overt measures to thwart attacks. I think we should do what is necessary within the limits of our civilized values and standards.

Senator HUMPHREY. What do you see as those values and standards?

Ambassador KIRKPATRICK. I do not believe that our values forbid us from defending ourselves. I do not believe that our values require us to passively accept brutal attacks against Americans as Americans.

Senator HUMPHREY. Would you recommend preemptive violence of a discrete nature?

By discrete, I mean individualized.

Ambassador KIRKPATRICK. I am not quite sure I know——

Senator HUMPHREY. Instead of these military attacks after the fact which some urge, what about highly selective operations to thwart plots that we have discovered through intelligence.

Ambassador KIRKPATRICK. First of all, I would emphasize and underline that we know we are not dealing here with individual acts of violence. We are not dealing with loners who wander into the balconies of theaters and shoot presidents.

We are dealing with organized, collective violence which enjoys broad support from the diplomatic, technical, military, logistical, and intelligence types, all of that we know.

We also know, roughly, who these people are who have been attacking us. I am not quite certain what the preemptive violence would be against these people since they already have been engaging in attacks against Americans.

I believe American retaliation against subgroups is entirely appropriate, whether or not we know the name of the particular man who pulled the trigger in a particular airport.

Senator HUMPHREY. You have noted that much of this terrorism is organized—you did not use the phrase, but I will use it—state-sponsored.

To what extent do you see the Soviet Union involved in this state-sponsorship of international terrorism?

Ambassador KIRKPATRICK. Senator Humphrey, we all know the Soviet Union has been deeply involved. We all know that the PLO, for example, is trained in the Soviet Union. We know because they tell us, among other things.

I would like to emphasize this. I do not really believe that going to the source is either necessary or desirable often in international affairs. I do not think the Soviet Union has made war against the United States. I think the Soviet Union helps sponsor some people who are engaged in unconventional war against us.

It is a little bit like having the flu. Some people will say a headache is only a symptom or the fever is only a symptom. My general view is we take care of the symptoms, that is a good thing in itself. I would like to take care of the symptoms of terrorist violence against Americans and continue our various efforts to persuade the Soviets that we can all live happily together if we treated each other with a bit more respect and less violence.

Senator HUMPHREY. Unfortunately, my time is up just as we get to a very interesting point.

Chairman GOLDWATER. Madam Ambassador, I want to thank you for your testimony. I think you have made one great contribution when you describe terrorism as war.

Sometimes we forget the history of war. Terrorism has been used since war started. I recall the method used by Genghis Kahn and Alexander the Great and particularly in World War II the British use of Ghurkas who were well known for their dirty little tricks. They went in a German tent one night where I think there were seven officers. They decapitated six of them. The one left woke up in the morning. It sort of scared the hell out of him. That was the end of their effectiveness.

I look on war, and I think you do, as not merely an extension of national policy. It is the ultimate act. What we are saying, I think, is the use of terrorism to create fear is one of the greatest weapons to bring victory in war.

I have often thought that had we threatened North Vietnam with extinction—that is a dirty, ugly word—that war would have ended in our favor.

Now, the thing that concerns me that you did not address yourself to is how long is it going to be before we see some real acts of terrorism right here in the United States? Do you think that can happen?

Ambassador KIRKPATRICK. Senator Goldwater, I think that, in principal, any free society is vulnerable to terrorism. We are a wide open society. I think that we have two major protections against terrorism at home.

One is a good domestic intelligence network, the FBI. I believe in this regard it is very important that the laws of our country be enforced in regard to the vast diplomatic personnel in New York at the United Nations as well as here in Washington.

The FBI is confronted with terrible problems in this regard and our laws are not as vigorously enforced as they perhaps should be.

Second, I believe the vigilance of the American citizens is finally our ultimate protection against domestic terrorism. I have heard from the Costa Rican president, and from foreign ministers, about the vigilance of individual Costa Ricans against terrorism and the

commitment of individual Costa Ricans to apprehend and punish terrorists if they are caught.

I believe that kind of vigilance and mobilization are going to be our ultimate protection against domestic terrorism.

Chairman GOLDWATER. I sincerely hope that through you and others we can get this message to the American people. The American people are not afraid of things they know. If they understand the sources of so-called terrorism, if they understand the responsibilities of our Government to protect under the Constitution the lives of Americans, I think we can rise up to it.

But I see a nation rather fearful of the Soviet Union, frightened to death of what might happen under attack by atomic weapons. I do not like that. I do not think you like that.

I think this is all part of warfare that we have not been taught or have talked about, fear, fear, fear.

I want to thank you, along with all the others, for your great service to our country. I just hope that you keep it up. I wish to God we had a few more like you.

Ambassador KIRKPATRICK. Thank you, Senator Goldwater.

Chairman GOLDWATER. It is a pleasure to have you.

This meeting, without objection, will be adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 10:45 a.m., the committee proceeded to other business.]

63-089 (32)